Indiana Department of Education
151 West Ohio Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2798

MEMORANDUM

TO: Educators and Concerned Citizens

FROM: Jeffery P. Zaring, Chief of Results and Reform

DATE: November 12, 2010

SUBJECT: Possible New Accountability Framework for Indiana

The Department worked with two committees to develop the attached school accountability frameworks. The State Board of Education approved our request to seek broader input and present simulation data at the November 23 special Sate Board of Education meeting and the December 1 regular State Board of Education meeting.

The frameworks are just that – frameworks. The numerical values may change as data are reviewed. The frameworks have been developed so that the results are expressed as a single letter grade. It also is possible to use them to derive separate grades in the areas that make up the models – English scores, math scores, graduation rate, and college and career attainment.

As a part of the development work, we expect to develop a model dashboard that will allow administrators to see how their school might fare.

We believe that we can derive a school corporation's score by treating it as a single school, although additional measure could be used. See, for example, the Annual Performance Report measures in IC 20-20-8.

The department appreciates receiving your comments about the frameworks, including any thoughts about the bullet points that list "notes, questions and other considerations." Please send comments to the above address or electronically to stboard@doe.in.gov.

The department hopes to ask the State Board of Education to initiate a formal rulemaking process on December 1. The process will provide additional opportunities for public input.

A Possible School Accountability Framework for Indiana

Elementary and Middle School

For each subject, percent passing equates to a number as follows:

≥ 90	2.00
85 – 89	1.75
80 – 84	1.50
75 – 79	1.25
70 – 74	1.00
65 – 69	0.75
60 – 64	0.50
< 60	0.00

Overall median growth translates into an addition or subtraction as follows:

High	+0.50
Average	no change
Low	-0.50

Growth of the bottom 25% of students translates into an addition or subtraction as follows:

High	+0.25
Average	no change
Low	-0.25

For the overall score, add up the subject area scores and convert to an overall grade:

4.0	A
3.50 – 3.99	B+
3.00 – 3.49	B
2.50 – 2.99	C+
2.00 – 2.49	C
1.50 – 1.99	D+
1.00 – 1.49	D
<1.00	F

Examples:

If a school has:	90% passing English	2.00	
	Average median growth	0.00	
	Low bottom 25%	-0.25	
	85% passing math	1.75	
	Average median growth	0.00	
	High bottom 25%	0.25	
Total		3.75	B+

If a school has:	50% passing English	0.00	
	High median growth	0.50	

	High bottom 25%	0.25	
	50% passing math	0.00	
	High median growth	0.50	
	High bottom 25%	0.25	
Total		1.50	D+

If a school has:	89% passing English	1.75	
	Low median growth	-0.5	
	Low bottom 25%	-0.25	
	89% passing math	1.75	
	Low median growth	-0.50	
	Low bottom 25%	-0.25	
Total		2.00	C

Notes, Questions and other Considerations

- Can a school earn an A+?
- ISTAR and IMAST are fully included in performance, with no restrictions. The Department will work on possible growth measures.
- The committee recommends we provide special consideration for Level 1 and 2 LEP students, perhaps giving credit for students who meet Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives.
- Should we emphasize growth more heavily during the first couple of years of a new school's existence?
- Should we use the NCLB full academic year definition for state accountability?
- Can we better handle feeder schools?

<u>High School</u>

For English 10 ECA, Algebra I ECA, and graduation rate, the percent passing and the percent graduating in four years (statutory rate with rigorous audit process) equates to a number as follows:

≥ 90	2.00
85 – 89	1.75
80 – 84	1.50
75 – 79	1.25
70 – 74	1.00
65 – 69	0.75
60 – 64	0.50
< 60	0.00

For college and career attainment, percentage of graduates that achieve a passing score on one or more AP or IB exams during high school, earn 3 college credits, or achieve an industry certification equates to a number as follows:

25.0% or higher	= 2.00
21.67 – 24.99%	= 1.75
18.34 – 21.66%	= 1.50

15.0 – 18.33%	= 1.25
11.67 – 14.99%	= 1.00
8.34 – 11.66	= .75
5.0 – 8.33%	= 0.50
< 5.0%	= 0.0

The school's scores in each area can be influenced as follows:

ECAs

- Cohort improvement from Grade 8 (using comparative measure, calculated similar to growth, if possible)
- Improvement of "at-risk" students (those who enter high school with record of poor achievement, poor attendance, and previous retention)
- Improvement in cohort performance beyond Grade 10

Graduation Rate

- Improvement from year to year (based on targets)
- Improvement of "at-risk" students (those who enter high school with record of poor achievement, poor attendance, and previous retention)
- Improvement in 5-year rate
- Improvement in Special Education Certificates of Completion
- Improvement in percentage of students who complete 20 Core 40 credits by the end of Grade 10

College and Career Attainment

- Improvement
- Improved participation

For the overall score, add up the subject area scores, divide by two and convert to an overall grade:

4.0	A
3.50 – 3.99	B+
3.00 – 3.49	B
2.50 – 2.99	C+
2.00 – 2.49	C
1.50 – 1.99	D+
1.00 – 1.49	D
<1.00	F

Notes, Questions and Other Considerations

- Can a school earn an A+?
- The committee recommends considering a SAT score of 1200 or higher (verbal and math) or ACT composite score of 26 as alternative to other college and career attainment measures? These scores qualify a student for the Academic Honors Diploma.
- ISTAR is fully included in performance, with no restrictions. The Department will work on possible growth measures.

- The committee recommends we provide special consideration for Level 1 and 2 LEP students, perhaps giving credit for students who meet Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives.
- Should we emphasize growth/improvement during the first couple of years of a new school's existence?
- Should we consider Increases in higher level diplomas? The committee believes the other college readiness and attainment measures may be more important.
- Should we use the NCLB full academic year definition for state accountability?